DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 561 CG 016 587

AUTHOR Drummond, Robert J.
TITLE Perceptions of Reality Therapy by the Staff of the Maine Youth Center, 1980-1981.
SPONS AGENCY Maine Univ., Orono. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 48p.; For related documents, see ED 223 920, ED 223 941, CG 016 350, and CG 016 588.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Change Strategies; *Counseling Effectiveness; *Counseling Techniques; Counseling Theories; Counselor Attitudes; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; Inservice Education; Locus of Control; *Program Effectiveness; Secondary Education; Staff Development; Youth Problems
IDENTIFIERS Maine Youth Center; *Reality Therapy

ABSTRACT

Reality Therapy was adopted as the treatment modality to be used with youths at the Maine Youth Center, the only juvenile correctional facility in the state. To evaluate the effectiveness of the program, staff members completed a series of self-report instruments and gathered demographic and attitude data three times during a 2-year period in 1980-81. There were 58 respondents during the summer of 1980, 106 in the winter of 1980, and 72 in the spring 1981 survey. Administrative, teaching, cottage, and treatment personnel were included. Results showed that overall, staff evaluations of Reality Therapy were positive and showed improvement from winter 1980 to spring 1981. The highest degree of success was reported on "not accepting excuses" followed by "being persistent." Getting youths to make a commitment to change was the hardest dimension to implement successfully. A set of 14 tables is included which details the survey results. The three appendices present verbatim staff comments on Reality Therapy techniques that worked well and those that did not work, as well as ways in which the Maine staff used Reality Therapy. A bibliography is also included. (JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED228561

PERCEPTIONS OF REALITY THERAPY

BY THE STAFF OF

THE MAINE YOUTH CENTER

1980 - 1981

CG 016587

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert J. Drummond

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Robert J. Drummond
Evaluator
UMO Teacher Corps Project

1982

ABSTRACT

Realty Therapy was adopted as the treatment modality to be used with youth at the Maine Youth Center. Education in Reality Therapy was provided the staff by a counselor who spent three days each week in developing inservice activities. The project was a part of the University of Maine Teacher Corps project focusing on youth advocacy.

The Maine Youth Center is the only juvenile correctional facility in the State of Maine. It handles youth, both male and female. There are approximately 240 staff employed in cottage, rounds, educational, treatment, and administrative positions.

In this report, the utilization and evaluation of Reality Therapy by the staff is discussed. The influence of Reality Therapy on the attitude toward their work as well as their perceptions of correctional environment is reported.

This report is part of a time series design. Staff were assessed three times during a two-year period. In this interim report, the 1980-81 perceptions of the staff are compared. The aspects of Reality Therapy that worked well and with which the staff had problems are listed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Hypotheses	2
Instruments	2
The Sample	4
Attitude Toward Reality Therapy	7
Use of Reality Therapy	10
Evaluation of Reality Therapy	13
Perceptions of the Correctional Environment	18
Attitude Toward Job	23
Attitude Toward Professionalism	27
Locus of Control	31
Appendix A	32
Techniques of Reality Therapy That Have Worked Well	
Appendix B	37
Techniques of Reality Therapy That Have Not Worked Well	
Appendix C	
Ways Maine Youth Staff Have Made Use of Reality Therapy	
Bibliography	

Reality Therapy was adopted as the treatment modality to be used with youth at the Maine Youth Center. The inservice training was provided by the University of Maine Teacher Corps project and was designed to involve and impact the entire staff. A Reality Therapy Trainer spent three days each week on site to facilitate training of the entire staff. The project utilized also a "Double-T" Training model. Staff from the Maine Youth Center who are to become the trainers of trainers were involved in practicum and seminars supervised by trained Reality Therapist and the Reality Therapy Institute in California. Twenty staff members will be prepared as trainers, allowing them to train additional staff in both the present and future. Dr. Glasser, the founder of Reality Therapy, gave a prsentation at the MYC.

Reality Therapy (Glasser, 1965) is a system of therapy which stresses that individuals are responsible for their own behavior - not the environment, not heredity, not the past, but each individual now. It is designed to help people learn how to take a look at what they are doing and then teaching them to evaluate their behavior and to make a plan to do better. Individuals are to accept the responsibility for what they do.

It is a method of helping people gain strength to handle responsibility through the stresses and problems of life. It stresses working with people through caring, human relationships and honest interest in others. It helps individuals to increase their self-respect and self-confidence.

The Site

The Maine Youth Center is located in South Portland and serves as the only juvenile correctional facility in the state of Maine. It handles youth, both male and females, who are sentenced by the courts for five to fourteen months.

There are approximately 240 staff employed in cottage, grounds, educational, treatment and administrative positions. The number of youth averages around 180 who range in age from 11 to 18.

Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation was to measure the effectiveness of Reality Therapy on both the staff and youth. This report will focus on the staff only and will report the results of the self-report instruments completed by the staff.

Hypothesis

The following are examples of the hypothesis to be tested through the evaluation design;

1. The staff will become more internally oriented as a result of reality therapy.
2. The staff will show higher job satisfaction after training and implementing reality therapy in their work.
3. The staff will utilize reality therapy principles increasingly more in their work after training.
4. The staff will show a more positive view of youth and the correctional environment after participating in R.T. training.

The Instruments

The staff were asked to complete six to seven instruments each testing period. Some of the instruments were not given each testing period but are rotated every other period. The instruments given each testing interval are:

1. A demographic data sheet - asks questions about position, years at MYC, educational level, age and sex.
2. Reality Therapy Attitude Scale (Drummond, 1980) - contains 18 Likert type of items on a five point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree on dimensions of Reality Therapy.

3. Reality Therapy Activities Questionnaire (Drummond, 1980) - includes 8 dimensions of reality therapy which have to be rated as to frequency of use and degree of success.

4. Nowicki-Strickland Adult Reaction Scale (Nowicki, S. and Duke, M. P., 1972) - contains 40 YES/NO statements with locus of control, the degree of internal or external orientation of the respondents.

Scales Which Are Rotated

1. Attitude Toward Work Scale (Alderfer, 1967) - has 36 items measuring attitudes towards Pay, Respect for Superiors, Respect of Peers and Growth on the Job.

2. Work Value Inventory (Super, 1970) - is made up of 45 items measuring attitudes of workers toward the importance of extrinsic and intrinsic values of work.

3. 16 Personal Factor Questionnaire (Cattell, 1970) - assesses 16 personality source traits of the normal individual.

4. Correctional Institution Environment Scale (Moos, 1974) - short form contains 36 True/False statements about nine dimensions of the social psychological environment of the correctional institution.

5. Attitude Toward Professionalism Scale (Drummond, 1981) - is made up of 30 Likert type of items based upon the 14 characteristics broadly associated with the goals of lifelong professional education as outlined by Houle (1980).

THE SAMPLE

The sample size varied from a high of 106 in the Winter of 1980 to a low of 58 during the summer of 1980. Seventy-two staff personnel completed the packet in the spring 1981 survey. Approximated 100 packets were distributed during the second and third surveys. The breakdown of the sample at the three time periods is presented in Table 1. The group remaining constant in all three surveys was the administrative group. Some variation in proportions may be due to how the respondents classified themselves. An attempt was made to get more cottage personnel to respond during the third sample.

Although the breakdown of the sample by job category differed from period to period, age and years of employment reported by the respondents was similar. The comparison of age and years of employment characteristics of the samples is listed in Table 2. The average age was slightly over 41 on all three testings. The average number of years employed at MYC was around 8 years. A comparison of the educational level of the two measurements conducted in 1980 is reported in Table 3. The question was not included in the 1981 form.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF STAFF RESPONDING TO SURVEYS BY POSITION

Type of Position	WINTER 1980 N	%	SUMMER 1980 N	%	SPRING 1981 N	%
Cottage	28	26.4	18	31.0	39	54.2
Administrative	10	9.4	8	13.8	8	11.1
Custodial	4	3.8	1	1.7	0	0.0
Teaching	14	13.2	5	8.6	5	6.9
Treatment	5	4.7	11	19.0	3	4.2
Other	15	14.2	8	13.8	17	23.6
Did Not Check	30	28.3	7	12.0	0	0.0
	106		58		72	

The sex distribution of staff responding to the surveys is presented in Table 4. The same proportion of males to females, 79% to 21%, was found in the Summer 80 and Spring 81 occasions.

Two additional questions were asked in the Spring 1981. The staff was asked if they were enrolled in any continuing education program. Six or 8.3 percent said they were; eight or 11.1 percent planned to and 57 to 79 percent checked no. One failed to respond to the item.

One third of the group indicated that they were participating in the Reality Therapy Trainer's program.

TABLE 2

AGE AND NUMBER OF YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT AT THE MYC

STAFF RESPONDING TO SURVEYS

	MEAN	MODE	MEDIAN	S.D.
AGE				
Winter 80	41.49	43	43.08	11.13
Summer 80	41.63	49	43.00	11.38
Spring 81	41.22	50	41.25	10.77
Years Employed at MYC				
Winter 80	8.07	2	8.6	6.28
Summer 80	8.98	4	9	7.04
Spring 81	7.82	3	6.92	5.08

TABLE 3

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF MYC STAFF RESPONDING TO SURVEYS

	Winter 80		Summer 80		Spring 81
less than grade 12	7	6.6	2	3.4	N.A.
HS GED	27	25.5	14	24.1	
Voc/Tech.	7	6.6	10	17.2	
Junior College	3	2.8	2	3.4	
4 Year College	20	18.9	15	25.8	
Graduate or Professional	13	12.3	12	20.7	
Missing	29	27.4	3	5.2	
	106		58		
	65 M		44	57	
	11 F		12	15	

TABLE 4

SEX DISTRIBUTION

	Winter 80		Summer 80		Spring 81	
Male	65	86%	44	79%	57	79%
Female	11	14%	12	21%	15	21%

ATTITUDE TOWARD REALITY THERAPY

The Attitude Toward Reality Therapy Attitude Scale was administered to the sample at each time period. The comparison of the 1980-1981 responses by staff to the items on the scale is given in Table 5.

There are three items dealing with the overall evaluation of Reality Therapy. The first is: Reality Therapy helped me to do a better job. There were 56 percent who agreed to some extent on the first testing 51 percent, on the second and 74 percent on the third. The second is: the program will be more effective as the result of Reality Therapy. There were 48 percent who agreed to some extent the winter of 1980; 54 percent, the summer of 1980 and 61 percent the spring of 1981. The third question delt with the staff's self understanding of the principles of R.T. Seventy percent agreed they had a good understanding, winter 1980; 69 percent summer 1980, and 88 percent, spring 1981.

There were some shifts on items dealing with the theoretical principles of Reality Therapy. Thirty five percent in the winter of 1980 agreed that what you learned from failure was failure; 58 percent in the summer of 1980 and 63 percent in the spring of 1981. Seventy-one percent in the winter of 1980 agreed to some extent that if needs are not fulfilled individuals will behave irresponsibly; 50 percent on the summer of 1980 and 80 percent in the spring of 1981. Fewer also felt the need to know the past in 81 than in 80. The staff also felt more intensely that people must interact with reality in 1981 than in 1980.

TABLE 5
COMPARISON OF 1980-81
RESPONSES BY STAFF TO ITEMS ON REALITY THERAPY
ATTITUDE SCALE BY MYC STAFF

Item		SA	A	?	DA	SDA	$\bar{x}$	SD
Deal with how a person feels	W 80	14.3	35.1	9.1	33.8	7.8	3.14	1.25
	S 80	20.3	22.0	8.5	33.9	15.3	3.02	1.42
	SP 81	14.1	28.2	7.0	40.8	9.9	3.04	1.29
Learn from failure how to fail	W 80	3.9	31.2	9.1	48.1	7.8	3.25	1.10
	S 80	18.6	39.0	3.4	25.4	13.6	2.76	1.38
	SP 81	28.2	35.2	5.6	26.8	2.8	2.40	1.24
Need to fail to be prepared for life	W 80	6.5	50.6	9.1	28.6	5.2	3.25	1.10
	S 80	8.5	30.5	20.3	28.8	11.9	3.05	1.20
	SP 81	7.0	36.6	16.9	28.2	11.3	3.00	1.18
People innately good and loving	W 80	5.2	59.7	10.4	23.4	1.3	2.53	0.92
	S 80	6.8	49.2	23.7	16.9	3.4	2.61	0.97
	SP 81	14.1	45.1	9.9	28.2	2.8	2.61	1.28
Needs not fulfilled behave irresponsibly	W 80	13.0	58.4	7.8	18.2	1.3	2.36	0.98
	S 80	18.6	40.7	32.2	8.5	0.0	2.31	0.88
	SP 81	16.9	63.4	7.0	11.3	1.4	2.17	0.89
Need to know past	W 80	14.3	49.4	11.7	19.5	3.9	2.47	1.09
	S 80	15.3	47.5	5.1	23.7	8.5	2.63	1.24
	SP 81	16.9	32.4	12.7	33.8	4.2	2.76	1.21
People deny reality of environment	W 80	5.2	37.7	20.8	36.4	0.0	2.88	0.97
	S 80	3.4	40.7	15.3	37.3	3.4	2.97	1.03
	SP 81	4.2	45.1	11.3	31.0	5.6	2.88	1.09
Basic needs love and affection	W 80	40.3	45.5	3.9	7.8	2.6	1.86	0.99
	S 80	40.7	45.8	10.2	3.4	0.0	1.76	0.77
	SP 81	47.9	46.5	0.0	5.6	0.0	1.63	0.76
Maintain position of superiority	W 80	2.6	5.2	7.8	39.0	45.5	4.21	0.97
	S 80	0.0	1.7	5.1	52.5	40.7	4.32	0.66
	SP 81	2.8	2.8	1.4	45.1	47.9	4.32	0.88
Anyone can become more responsible	W 80	35.1	53.2	6.5	5.2	0.0	1.79	0.76
	S 80	49.2	50.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.51	0.50
	SP 81	33.8	60.6	2.8	1.4	1.4	1.76	0.71
Individuals capable of change	W 80	31.2	63.6	3.9	1.3	0.0	1.72	0.56
	S 80	37.3	57.6	3.4	1.7	0.0	1.70	0.62
	SP 81	38.0	59.2	1.4	1.4	0.0	1.66	0.58
People capable of helping each other	W 80	40.3	54.5	2.6	2.6	0.0	1.66	0.64
	S 80	42.4	55.9	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.59	0.53
	SP 81	39.4	60.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.61	0.49
People must interact with reality	W 80	13.0	63.6	18.2	5.2	0.0	2.04	0.68
	S 80	27.1	40.7	23.7	8.5	0.0	2.14	0.92
	SP 81	19.3	71.9	3.5	5.3	0.0	1.95	0.67
People have responsibilities to each other	W 80	24.7	61.0	10.4	3.9	0.0	1.83	0.66
	S 80	32.2	50.8	16.9	0.0	0.0	1.85	0.69
	SP 81	27.6	67.2	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.83	0.70
You must be treated warmly	W 80	18.2	57.1	14.3	9.1	1.3	2.10	0.89
	S 80	16.9	47.5	23.7	10.2	1.7	2.32	0.94
	SP 81	24.6	47.4	19.3	8.8	0.0	2.12	0.89
Reality therapy helped me do better job	W 80	7.8	48.1	28.6	14.3	1.3	2.48	0.91
	S 80	13.6	37.3	40.7	3.4	5.1	2.49	0.95
	SP 81	20.4	53.7	24.1	1.9	0.0	2.07	0.73

TABLE 5

(Continued)

Item		SA	A	?	DA	SDA	$\bar{x}$	SD
Have good understanding of principles of R.T.	W 80	7.8	62.3	23.4	3.9	2.6	2.24	0.79
	S 80	11.9	57.6	28.8	1.7	0.0	2.20	0.66
	SP 81	14.3	73.2	8.9	3.6	0.0	2.02	0.62
Program will be more effective as result of R.T.	W 80	11.7	37.7	46.8	2.6	1.3	2.37	0.81
	S 80	13.6	40.7	40.7	3.4	1.7	2.39	0.83
	SP 81	15.8	45.6	35.1	1.8	1.8	2.28	0.82

USE OF REALITY THERAPY

The staff was asked to respond how often they put into practice eight dimensions of Reality Therapy. The comparison across the three time periods is presented in Table 6. The staff reports more frequent use of making friends with the youth they work with; getting youth to evaluate what they are doing; not punishing but not interfering with natural consequences during spring 1981 than during winter and summer of 1980. It should also be noted that on all dimensions fewer check the "never" category in the spring of 1981 than either summer or winter of 1980.

SUCCESS IN USING REALITY THERAPY

The staff was asked to report their success in using the principles of Reality Therapy. The results from the three points in time are included in Table 7. In general on all but one item making friends with the youth I work with, the staff indicated a higher degree of success. The highest degree of success was reported on "not accepting their excuse" followed by "being persistent." There were fewer staff members reporting "no" success in the spring of 1981 than during the summer or winter of 1980. The dimension staff found most difficult to implement was "getting youth to set a plan to do better." There was improvement in "getting youth to make a commitment to change;" however, this remains one of the hardest dimensions to implement successfully.

It should be noted that 63.9 percent of those responding on the spring 1981 survey reported that they had made use of Reality Therapy. Five or 6.9 percent stated they did not and 21 or 29.2 percent did not check the item.

TABLE 6

USE OF REALITY THERAPY DIMENSIONS BY STAFF

ITEM		PERCENT OF USE		
		OFTEN	SELDOM	NEVER
1. Making friends with the youth I work with	Jan 80	52.8	12.3	3.8
	July 80	69.6	25.0	0.0
	Mar 81	72.2	11.1	0.0
2. Getting youth to look at their behavior	Jan 80	49.1	12.3	4.7
	July 80	75.0	14.3	3.6
	Mar 81	68.1	13.9	0.0
3. Getting youth to evaluate what they are doing	Jan 80	41.5	17.9	7.5
	July 80	60.7	26.8	3.6
	Mar 81	69.4	13.9	0.0
4. Getting youth to set a plan to do better	Jan 80	33.0	20.8	13.2
	July 80	66.1	14.3	8.9
	Mar 81	55.6	22.2	4.2
5. Getting youth to make a commitment to change	Jan 80	35.8	18.9	12.3
	July 80	57.1	21.4	10.7
	Mar 81	52.8	25.0	1.4
6. Not accepting their excuses	Jan 80	42.5	14.2	11.3
	July 80	66.1	16.1	8.9
	Mar 81	58.3	16.7	5.6
7. Not punishing, but not interferring with natural consequences	Jan 80	28.3	23.6	10.4
	July 80	45.2	37.5	5.4
	Mar 81	52.8	29.2	1.4
8. Being persistent	Jan 80	58.5	3.8	5.7
	July 80	66.1	17.9	3.6
	Mar 81	69.4	9.7	0.0

TABLE 7

DEGREE OF SUCCESS IN USING REALITY THERAPY BY MYC STAFF

ITEM		DEGREE OF SUCCESS EXTREMELY	SOMEWHAT	NO
1. Making friends with the youth I work with	Jan 80	18.9	36.8	4.7
	July 80	37.5	51.8	0.0
	Mar 81	34.7	38.9	0.0
2. Getting youth to look to their behavior	Jan 80	9.4	47.2	3.8
	July 80	19.6	64.3	1.8
	Mar 81	23.6	54.2	0.0
3. Getting youth to evaluate what they are doing	Jan 80	6.6	44.3	6.6
	July 80	14.3	69.6	1.8
	Mar 81	22.2	51.4	1.4
4. Getting youth to set a plan to do better	Jan 80	6.6	34.9	17.9
	July 80	14.3	53.6	14.3
	Mar 81	19.4	48.6	8.3
5. Getting youth to make a commitment to change	Jan 80	3.8	37.6	16.0
	July 80	7.1	74.3	16.1
	Mar 81	11.1	62.5	4.2
6. Not accepting their excuses	Jan 80	18.9	32.1	5.7
	July 80	33.9	44.6	5.4
	Mar 81	48.6	25.0	1.4
7. Not punishing, but not interferring with natural consequences	Jan 80	14.2	32.1	6.6
	July 80	28.6	53.6	5.4
	Mar 81	29.2	44.4	1.4
8. Being persistent	Jan 80	19.8	33.0	3.8
	July 80	41.1	39.3	1.8
	Mar 81	43.1	29.2	0.0

Made Use of Reality Therapy

Yes	46	63.9	59	81.9	Worked directly with youth 13.9
No	5	6.9	10	No	
Missing	0	29.2	3	Missing	4.2

Evaluation of Reality Therapy

The staff was asked what Techniques of Reality Therapy had worked well for them, what aspects have not worked well both during the summer of 1980 and the spring of 1981. Also, on the third survey, the staff was asked: Have you made use of Reality Therapy? If yes, in what ways? The complete list of comments to what worked well is included in Appendix A. A comparison of the major themes (in rank order) is reported in Table 8.

The staff during both time periods reported success in making friends with youth. Getting youth to set plans was reported more frequently as working well in the spring of 1981 than in the summer of 1980. The other dimensions were relatively reported about as frequently during both time periods. Thirty-eight of 56 staff members made comments of what worked well for them in the summer sample and 52 of 70 in the spring sample.

TABLE 8

ASPECTS OF REALITY THERAPY REPORTED TO HAVE WORKED WELL BY STAFF

SUMMER 1980	SPRING 1981
1. Making friends	1. Plan Writing
2. Getting youth to look at behavior	2. Making Friends
3. Commitment, Responsibility	3. Persistence
4. Persistence	4. Getting youth to look at behavior
5. Involvement	5. Commitment, Responsibility
6. Not accepting excuses	6. Not accepting excuses
7. All techniques	7. Getting youth to evaluate behavior
8. Plan Writing	8. All techniques
9. Positive Reinforcement	9. Positive Reinforcement
10. Following natural consequences	10. Getting youth to look at values
11. Getting yout to evaluating behavior	11. Following natural consequences

The staff was asked in both surveys what techniques of Reality Therapy have you had problems with or aspects which have not worked well. Twenty five of 56 individuals wrote one or more comments summer, 1980. Forty-seven of 70 wrote comments spring, 1981. Approximately 80 percent of the responses recorded on the first survey related to plan writing. Plan writing was still the most mentioned them on the second survey, but the number of comments was fewer, about 40 percent. About 25 percent of the group spring 1981 indicated that getting a commitment was a problem. It was the second most frequent problem listed on the summer 1980 survey also. About twenty percent of the sample the second survey wrote in that they had "no" problems with R.T. The number of different problems listed on the second survey were much higher than on the first survey. The verbatum comments are reported in Appendix B of the report.

TABLE 9

ASPECTS OF REALITY THERAPY WITH WHICH STAFF HAS PROBLEMS

Summer 1980	Spring 1981
1. Plan writing	1. Plan writing
2. Getting a commitment	2. Getting a commitment
3. Getting youth to look at values	3. None
4. Persistence	4. Follow-up
5. Time for involvement	5. Time for involvement
6. Lack of continuous contact	6. Paper work, mechanics
7. Making friends with youth	7. Getting youth to evaluate behavior
8. Follow-up	8. Time for involvement, training
	9. Disciplinary steps
	10. Personal and social behavior of youth
	11. Not punishing, not interferring
	12. Making friends with youth

The staff on the spring 1981 survey were asked to tell in what ways they had used Reality Therapy. Forty-four of the seventy respondents included some type of comment. The comments are included in Apprendix C of the report. The majority of comments deal with applying RT to work at the MYC but several have indicated that they have utilized it with their own children and family with people in general, and with subordinate employers.

Some examples are as follows:

All aspects of treatment and in my own daily life.

Day-to-day contact with residents

Taking time for "small talk" with students -

Words of encouragement, their goals, smiles and an air of acceptance of them regardless of their status.

Being positive and realistic in dealing with students.

It is a way of life in my classroom.

Crisis situations

Plans for leaves

By trying to get involved with students by knowing his outside problems so you can try to help him more.

Turning negative thinking into positive.

PERCEPTIONS OF THE CORRECTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

The staff both in the summer of 1980 and the spring of 1981 were given the Moos Correctional Institution Environment Scale. The comparison of the environment at both time periods is presented in Table 10.

A higher percentage of staff checked true to the following items in 1981 than in 1980

Residents are proud of MYC	(31.4-27.6)
Little time to encourage residents	(21.4-15.5)
Youth encouraged to show their feelings	(74.3-70.7)
Residents must follow schedule	(70.0-63.8)
Residents really try to improve	(61.4-50.0)
Youth encouraged to plan future	(70.0-55.2)
Youth rarely talk about their personal problems	(22.9-19.0)
Staff are always changing their minds	(32.9-27.6)
Decisions about center made by staff	(42.9-32.8)
Youth rarely help each other	(20.0-17.2)
Staff discourage criticism	(38.6-36.2)
Care more about feelings than personal problems	(60.0-53.4)
Things disorganized around here	(67.1-58.6)
Staff tell youth when they are doing well	(81.4-79.3)
Youth rarely punished	(24.3-15.5)
MYC has very little social activities	(40.0-25.9)
Day room often messy	(14.3-10.3)
Staff help youth get acquainted	(84.3-82.8)
Staff and youth tell how	(55.7-55.0)
They feel about each other center usually looks messy	(17.1-10.3)
Youth explained how center works	(78.6-74.1)
Youth will be transferred if disobedient	(57.1-55.2)
Little group spirit at MYC	(35.7-32.8)
More mature youth take care of less	(51.4-48.3)
Youth have a say about what goes on	(58.6-56.9)
MYC emphasizes job training	(65.7-53.4)

A lower percentage of staff checked true on the following items in 1981 than in 1980.

Staff acts on resident's suggestions	(44.3-56.9)
Facilities are always neat	(75.7-82.8)
Staff interested in follow-up of youth	(58.6-62.1)
Youth hide feelings from the staff	(68.6-72.4)
Little emphasis on what youth do after	(22.9-27.6)
Discussions emphasize understanding personal problems	(71.4-81.0)
MYC well organized unit	(37.5-48.3)
Youth put a lot of energy	(38.6-46.6)
Youth say anything to counselors	(14.3-20.7)
Staff interested in learning about feelings	(34.3-39.3)
Staff go out of their way to help youth	(68.6-74.1)

If program changed, youth told why	(85.7-87.9)
Youth may criticize staff members to face	(37.1-43.1)
Youth care about each other	(45.7-48.3)
Staff gives youth little responsibility	(12.9-17.2)
Encouraged to lean new ways of doing	(82.9-87.9)
Personal problems openly talked about	(62.9-70.7)
People say what they really think	(41.1-43.1)
Youth careful what they say	(77.1-79.3)
Youth encouraged to start their own activities	(64.3-67.2)

It should be noted that there are not major discrepancies between the perceptions at both time periods. There are only six items where the discrepancy is 10 percent or higher. Two of the items deal with practical orientation (14, 15). These items related to youth encouraged to plan for the future and the emphasis on job training. There were one item each from the Autonomy (4), Personal Problem (33), Involvement (46), and Staff Control Scales (36).

Over 75 percent of the groups checked true for items 7, 8, 13, 16, 20, 23, 44, and 48. Three of the items were on the clarity scale.

Staff sometimes argue with each other

If a program is changed for an individual, someone in the staff tells him/her why. Staff tells youth when they're doing well.

The item from the order scale was: the staff makes sure that the facilities are always neat. The item from the autonomy scale was: residents are encouraged to plan for the future. The item from the support scale was: the staff help new residents get acquainted at the center. The item from the practical orientation scale was: youth are encouraged to learn new ways of doing things. The item from the Expressiveness scale was: youth are careful about what they say when staff are around.

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF STAFF PERCEPTIONS
OF THE CORRECTIONAL ENVIRONMENT
SUMMER 1980 AND SPRING 1980

	Item	Year	Missing	True	False
1.	Residents Proud of MYC	80	12.1	27.6	60.3
		81	10.0	31.4	58.6
2.	Little Time to Encourage Residents	80	3.4	15.5	81.0
		81	7.1	21.4	71.4
3.	Youth Encouraged to Show Their Feelings	80	13.8	70.7	15.5
		81	7.1	74.3	18.6
4.	Staff Act on Resident's Suggestions	80	8.6	56.9	34.5
		81	14.3	44.3	41.4
5.	Little Emphasis on Youth Making Plans for Getting Out	80	5.2	17.2	77.6
		81	7.1	12.9	80.0
6.	Youth Share Personal Problems With Each Other	80	10.3	62.1	27.6
		81	10.0	62.9	27.1
7.	Facilities Are Always Neat	80	6.9	82.8	10.3
		81	10.0	75.7	14.3
8.	Staff Sometimes Argue With Each Other	80	6.9	84.5	8.6
		81	7.1	81.4	11.4
9.	Residents Must Follow Schedule	80	5.2	63.8	31.0
		81	7.1	70.0	22.9
10.	Residents Really Try To Improve	80	13.8	50.0	36.2
		81	15.7	61.4	22.9
11.	Staff Interested in Follow-Up of Youth	80	5.2	62.1	32.8
		81	11.4	58.6	30.0
12.	Youth Hide Feelings From the Staff	80	12.1	72.4	15.5
		81	11.4	68.6	20.0
13.	Residents Are Encouraged To Take Leadership	80	3.4	86.2	10.3
		81	8.6	85.7	5.7
14.	Youth Encouraged to Plan Future	80	25.9	55.2	19.0
		81	8.6	70.0	21.4
15.	Youth Rarely Talk About Their Personal Problems	80	6.9	19.0	74.1
		81	8.6	22.9	68.6
16.	Day Room is Often Messy	80	10.3	10.3	79.3
		81	12.9	14.3	72.9

TABLE 10 (Continued)

	Item	Year	Missing	True	False
17.	If Program Changed, Youth Told Why	80	3.4	87.9	8.6
		81	7.1	85.7	7.1
18.	Youth May Criticize Staff Members to Face	80	5.2	43.1	51.7
		81	10.0	37.1	52.9
19.	Youth Care About Each Other	80	6.9	48.3	44.8
		81	15.7	45.7	38.6
20.	Staff Help Youth Get Acquainted	80	5.2	82.8	12.1
		81	10.0	84.3	5.7
21.	Staff and Youth Tell How They Feel About Each Other	80	13.8	50.0	36.2
		81	12.9	55.7	31.4
22.	Staff Gives Youth Little Responsibility	80	6.9	17.2	75.9
		81	10.0	12.9	77.1
23.	Encouraged to Learn New Ways of Doing	80	3.4	87.9	8.6
		81	8.6	82.9	8.6
24.	Personal Problems Openly Talked About	80	6.9	70.7	22.4
		81	12.9	62.9	24.3
25.	Center Usually Looks Messy	80	5.2	10.3	84.5
		81	11.4	17.1	71.4
26.	Youth Explained How Center Works	80	10.3	74.1	15.5
		81	11.4	78.6	10.0
27.	Youth Will Be Transfers If Disobedient	80	8.6	55.2	36.2
		81	10.0	57.1	32.9
28.	Little Group Spirit at MYC	80	5.2	32.8	62.1
		81	12.9	35.7	51.4
29.	More Mature Youth Take Care of Less	80	12.1	48.3	39.7
		81	12.9	51.4	35.7
30.	People Say What They Really Think	80	8.6	43.1	48.3
		81	11.4	41.4	57.1
31.	Youth Have a Say About What Goes On	80	10.3	56.9	32.8
		81	11.4	58.6	30.0
32.	Little Emphasis on What Youth Do After	80	5.2	27.6	67.2
		81	10.0	22.9	67.1
33.	Discussions Emphasize Understanding Persons	80	10.3	81.0	8.6
		81	14.3	71.4	12.9
34.	MYC Well Organized Unit	80	12.1	48.3	39.7
		81	14.3	37.5	50.0
35.	Staff Are Always Changing Minds	80	12.1	27.6	60.3
		81	18.6	32.9	48.6
36.	Decisions About Center Made By Staff	80	8.6	32.8	58.6
		81	12.9	42.9	44.3

TABLE 10 (Continued)

Item	Year	Missing	True	False
37. Youth Put a Lot of Energy	80	15.5	46.6	37.9
	81	17.1	38.6	44.3
38. Youth Rarely Help Each Other	80	12.1	17.2	70.7
	81	12.9	20.0	67.1
39. Youth Say Anything to Counselors	80	12.1	20.7	67.1
	81	12.9	14.3	72.9
40. Staff Discourage Criticism	80	15.5	36.2	48.3
	81	12.9	38.6	48.6
41. Care More About Feelings Than Personal	80	20.7	53.4	25.9
	81	11.4	60.0	28.6
42. Staff Interest in Learning About Feelings	80	15.5	39.3	55.2
	81	10.0	34.3	55.7
43. Things Disorganized Around Here	80	10.3	58.6	31.0
	81	10.0	67.1	22.9
44. Staff Tell Youth When They Are Doing Well	80	13.8	79.3	6.9
	81	11.4	81.4	7.1
45. Youth Rarely Punished	80	13.8	15.5	70.7
	81	10.0	24.3	65.7
46. MYC Has Very Little Social Activities	80	12.1	25.9	62.1
	81	8.6	40.0	51.4
47. Staff Go Out of Way to Help Youth	80	12.1	74.1	13.8
	81	12.9	68.6	18.6
48. Youth Careful What They Say	80	10.3	79.3	10.3
	81	8.6	77.1	14.3
49. Youth Encouraged to Start Their Own Activities	80	13.8	67.2	19.0
	81	12.9	64.3	22.9
50. MYC Emphasizes Job Training	80	13.8	53.4	32.8
	81	11.4	65.7	22.9

ATTITUDE TOWARD JOB

The staff was administered the Attitude Toward Job Scale both during the winter 1980 and the spring of 1981. The responses by item are listed in Table 11. There are four scales on the instrument. The means and standard deviations for the two testings are presented on Table 12. The staff had significant higher mean scores on each of the four scales: Pay, Job, Boss, and Co-worker in 1981 than in 1980. The higher the mean score the more positive attitude toward the job dimension. Three of the differences were significant at the .01 level (Pay, Job and Co-worker) and one at the .05 level (Boss).

TABLE 11

COMPARISON OF WINTER 1980 AND SPRING 1981

RESPONSES TO ATTITUDE TOWARD JOB SCALE BY MAINE YOUTH CENTER STAFF

Winter, 1980

	?		Relative Frequency Percent SA	A	?	DA	SDA	(Missing)	N
1.	Careful planning is necessary in my job.	80	21.7	43.4	4.7	2.8	1.9	25.5	106
		81	25.0	63.9	1.4	9.7	0.0	0.0	72
2.	My job requires that a person use a wide-range of abilities.	80	29.2	40.6	0.9	3.8	0.0	25.5	
		81	45.8	48.6	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	
3.	Few things in my job give me a sense of accomplishment.	80	1.9	13.2	1.9	39.6	17.9	25.5	
		81	1.4	16.7	2.8	62.5	16.7	0.0	
4.	My major abilities are seldom needed at work.	80	1.9	9.4	2.8	43.4	16.0	26.4	
		81	2.8	6.9	8.3	65.3	16.7	0.0	
5.	In my job I have the same things to do over and over again.	80	6.6	30.2	1.9	32.1	3.8	25.5	
		81	11.1	48.6	5.6	33.3	0.0	1.4	
6.	This job has helped me to see some talents I never knew I had.	80	9.4	40.6	5.7	18.9	0.0	25.5	
		81	12.5	52.8	6.9	23.6	0.0	4.2	
7.	My job is constantly changing.	80	8.5	29.2	5.7	30.2	0.9	25.5	
		81	6.9	45.8	8.3	34.7	2.8	1.4	
8.	My job requires making one or more important decisions everyday.	80	17.0	36.8	7.5	10.4	1.9	26.4	
		81	23.6	51.4	8.3	15.3	0.0	1.4	
9.	I am rarely asked to try new ways of doing things at work.	80	3.8	23.6	4.7	34.9	7.5	25.5	
		81	5.6	36.1	6.9	47.2	4.2	0.0	
10.	I seldom get the feeling of learning new things from my work.	80	3.8	15.1	3.8	45.3	5.7	26.4	
		81	2.8	15.3	2.8	73.6	4.2	1.4	
11.	I do not have the opportunity to do challenging things at work.	80	4.7	18.9	2.8	40.6	7.5	25.5	
		81	4.2	18.1	6.9	56.9	12.5	1.4	
12.	I have an opportunity to use many of my skills at work.	80	13.2	48.1	2.8	10.4	0.0	25.5	
		81	8.3	66.7	8.3	12.5	2.8	1.4	
13.	It is easy to talk with my boss about my job.	80	13.2	46.2	5.7	6.6	2.8	25.5	
		81	20.8	51.4	6.9	11.1	4.2	5.6	
14.	My boss takes account of my wishes and desires.	80	8.5	37.7	13.2	13.2	1.9	25.5	
		81	13.9	45.8	16.7	13.9	4.2	5.6	
15.	My boss keeps me informed about what is happening in the Center.	80	10.4	32.1	9.4	17.0	5.7	25.5	
		81	12.5	44.4	9.7	22.2	5.6	5.6	
16.	My boss often asks for my opinion about the job.	80	5.7	39.6	7.5	15.1	6.6	25.5	
		81	11.1	37.5	8.3	34.7	2.8	5.6	
17.	My boss gives me credit when I do good work.	80	7.5	41.5	7.5	13.2	3.8	26.4	
		81	15.3	41.7	12.5	19.4	6.9	4.2	

TABLE 11
(Continued)

			Relative Frequency Percent					
			SA	A	?	DA	SDA	Missing
18.	My boss keeps a close check on his people.	80	8.5	34.9	10.4	14.2	5.7	26.4
		81	9.7	36.1	18.1	18.1	12.5	5.6
19.	My boss will play one person against another.	80	1.9	4.7	7.5	33.0	26.4	26.4
		81	2.8	8.3	18.1	37.5	29.2	4.2
20.	My boss does not let me know where I could improve my performance.	80	4.7	13.2	9.4	39.6	6.6	26.4
		81	5.6	16.7	18.1	41.7	13.9	4.2
21.	My boss expects people to do things his way.	80	5.7	22.6	10.6	31.1	4.7	26.4
		81	5.6	26.4	13.9	40.3	8.3	5.6
22.	I feel that there are certain "right" things to tell my boss.	80	4.7	34.9	9.4	19.8	1.9	29.2
		81	8.3	40.3	18.1	25.0	4.2	4.2
23.	My co-workers respect my opinion when I desagree with them.	80	1.9	45.3	17.9	3.8	1.9	29.2
		81	6.9	59.7	20.8	8.2	0.0	4.2
24.	I can count on my co-workers to give me a hand when I need it.	80	22.6	40.6	4.7	3.8	1.9	26.4
		81	19.4	63.9	9.7	1.4	2.8	2.8
25.	I can speak my mind to my co-workers.	80	15.1	50.0	1.9	4.7	1.9	26.4
		81	19.4	69.4	6.9	1.4	0.0	2.8
26.	My co-workers welcome opinions different from their own.	80	1.9	47.2	12.3	7.5	3.8	27.4
		81	11.1	43.1	29.2	11.1	2.8	2.8
27.	My co-workers are highly critical of each other when mistakes are made.	80	10.4	17.0	8.5	30.2	7.5	26.4
		81	8.3	22.2	13.9	44.4	8.3	2.8
28.	My co-workers are uncooperative unless it is to their advantage.	80	3.8	10.4	9.4	39.6	9.4	27.4
		81	2.8	6.9	18.1	56.9	11.1	4.2
29.	My co-workers will not stick out their necks to me.	80	7.5	10.4	23.6	26.4	5.7	26.4
		81	5.6	12.5	29.2	38.9	9.7	4.2
30.	I have few close friends among my co-workers.	80	4.7	15.1	3.8	36.8	10.4	29.2
		81	8.3	38.9	2.8	30.6	13.9	5.6
31.	Considering the work required, the pay for this job is fair.	80	0.9	18.9	9.4	22.6	17.9	30.2
		81	1.4	23.6	9.7	43.1	20.8	1.4
32.	Compared to the rates for similar work here my pay is good.	80	1.9	17.0	10.4	22.6	17.0	31.1
		81	1.4	25.0	19.4	33.3	19.4	1.4
33.	My pay is adequate to provide for the basic things in life.	80	1.9	25.5	4.7	24.5	12.3	31.1
		81	2.8	34.7	11.1	27.8	22.2	1.4
34.	In general I am satisfied with my pay.	80	1.9	18.9	4.7	29.2	14.2	31.1
		81	0.0	25.0	13.9	34.7	25.0	1.4
35.	Compared to the rates for similar jobs in other places, my pay is poor.	80	12.3	27.4	14.2	12.3	2.8	31.1
		81	16.7	33.3	19.4	23.6	5.6	1.4
36.	Compared to the rates for less demanding jobs, the pay for my job is poor.	80	11.3	28.3	9.4	17.9	1.9	31.1
		81	19.4	27.8	27.8	20.8	2.8	1.4

TABLE 12

COMPARISON OF THE 1980 AND 1981 PERCEPTIONS OF JOB ATTITUDES BY MYC STAFF

Scale	Spring, 1981 $\bar{x}$	SD	Winter, 1980 $\bar{x}$	SD	t
Pay	16.63	3.33	13.20	7.51	3.40
Job	37.74	3.87	31.83	14.33	3.34
Boss	29.63	7.73	26.19	12.31	2.02
Co-Worker	25.03	4.57	20.89	9.89	3.18
	N = 72		N = 70		

ATTITUDE TOWARD PROFESSIONALISM

The responses to the Attitude Toward Professionalism scale is presented in Table 13.

More people "strongly agreed" to the item:

I would like to see all individuals, working in my field be able to perform their duties on acceptable level. Second highest was: I feel there needs to be a system to deny the right of practice of people in my field who are incompetent or fail to act in terms of acceptable ethical standards.

The six items that the highest mean scores were:

1. I would like to see all individuals working in my field to be able to perform their duties at an acceptable level. (5.72)
2. I feel a need to study other things than topics related to my work. (5.46)
3. The more inservice or continuing education I have the better able I am to perform my job. (5.30)
4. I feel there is a need to create more intelligent and practically rewarding collaboration between my job areas and other similar areas. (5.23)
5. I feel that the general public needs to be made aware and accept the work done by people in my field. (5.18)
6. I feel that continuing education helps improve my performance on the job. (5.05)

TABLE 13

ATTITUDE TOWARD PROFESSIONALISM BY MYC STAFF

SPRING 1981

	Strongly Disagree 1	2	Disagree 3	Uncertain 4	Agree 5	6	Strongly Agree 7	Missing
1. I feel that I need continually to define and clarify my job functions and roles.	5 6.9	3 4.2	30 41.7	7 9.7	19 26.4	5 6.9	3 4.2	
2. I feel I need to be involved in life-long education in my job.	3 4.2	1 1.4	17 23.6	8 11.1	29 40.3	7 9.7	6 8.3	1 1.4
3. There is a body of information and theory that I need to master in my field.	3 4.2	0 0.0	13 18.1	12 16.7	32 44.4	6 8.3	5 6.9	1 1.4
4. There is constantly new theoretical knowledge that I need to know in my field,	2 2.8	1 1.4	13 18.1	8 11.1	38 52.8	4 5.6	5 6.9	1 1.4
5. I need to know and use theoretical knowledge in order to deal competently with specific practical problems.	2 2.8	2 2.8	17 23.6	10 13.9	29 40.3	5 6.9	4 5.6	3 4.2
6. I need to be able to synthesize knowledge rather than to just apply a specific factor principle to a particular case.	1 1.4	2 2.8	5 6.9	14 19.4	29 40.3	8 11.1	9 12.5	4 5.6
7. I need to be involved in a program of continuing education throughout my life to be effective on my job.	6 8.3	1 1.4	17 23.6	22 16.7	6 30.6	6 8.3	6 8.3	2 2.8
8. I feel that there needs to be built a substantial body of supporting knowledge which practitioners can use in understanding practical affairs in my vocation.	1 1.4	1 1.4	8 11.1	11 15.3	32 44.4	7 9.7	10 13.9	2 2.8
9. The more inservice or continuing education I have the better able I am to perform my job.	1 1.4	0 0.0	4 5.6	7 9.7	37 51.4	7 9.7	15 20.8	2 1.4
10. I feel a need to study other things than topics related to my work.	1 1.4	0 0.0	2 2.8	6 8.3	32 44.4	14 19.4	15 20.8	2 2.8
11. I need a broad general or liberal arts education to do my job well.	7 9.7	2 2.8	21 29.2	15 20.8	14 19.4	7 9.7	5 6.9	1 1.4

TABLE 13
(Continued)

	1 Strongly Disagree	2	3 Disagree	4 Uncertain	5 Agree	6	7 Strongly Agree	Missing
12. I feel a need to establish identity as a worker in my field.	2 2.8	1 1.4	20 27.8	5 6.9	33 45.8	6 8.3	5 6.9	0 0.0
13. I feel that people working in my field should be licensed.	7 9.7	1 1.4	31 43.1	14 19.4	9 12.5	1 1.4	9 12.5	0 0.0
14. I feel that I am obligated to demonstrate continuing competency or to provide evidence that I have sought to maintain able performance on my job.	1 1.4	0 0.0	8 11.1	8 11.1	40 55.6	7 9.7	6 8.3	2 2.8
15. I would like to see all individuals working in my field to be able to perform their duties at an acceptable level.	1 1.4	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 2.8	36 50.0	8 11.1	23 31.9	2 2.8
16. I feel that inservice or continuing education in my field should be guided primarily by experts who work in my profession.	2 2.8	1 1.4	11 15.3	6 8.3	26 36.1	6 8.3	15 20.8	5 6.9
17. I feel that my job roles and relationships are unique to my field and not understood by those outside.	2 2.8	1 1.4	17 23.6	13 18.1	21 29.2	4 5.6	11 15.3	3 4.2
18. I feel that there needs to be legal or formal administrative rulings which protect the speical rights and privileges of practitioner in my field.	4 5.6	1 1.4	6 8.3	18 25.0	15 20.8	7 9.7	17 23.6	4 5.6
19. I feel that people in my field need to have special protection and privileges from legislative, judicial or administrative bodies.	7 9.7	1 1.4	15 20.8	13 18.1	12 16.7	5 6.9	15 20.8	4 5.6
20. I feel that the general public needs to be made aware and accept the work done by people in my field.	4 5.6	0 0.0	3 4.2	5 6.9	33 45.8	7 9.7	17 23.6	3 4.2
21. People respect those working in my field or occupation.	1 1.4	4 5.6	11 15.3	22 30.6	21 29.2	7 9.7	3 4.2	3 4.2
22. I feel that continuing education helps improve my performance on the job.	1 1.4	1 1.4	7 9.7	7 9.7	32 44.4	11 15.3	9 12.5	4 5.6

TABLE 13
(continued)

	Strogly Disagree 1	2	3 Disagree	4 Uncertain	5 Agree	6	Strongly Agree 7	Missing
23. I feel that ethical codes need to be constantly refined in my field.	1 1.4	0 0.0	6 8.3	11 15.3	28 38.9	10 13.9	11 15.3	5 6.9
24. I feel that preservice and inservice education in my field needs to be concerned about ethical issues and their practical applications.	1 1.4	1 1.4	3 4.2	13 18.1	29 40.3	8 11.1	11 11.1	6 8.3
25. I feel that there needs to be a system to deny the right of practice of people in my field who are incompetent or fail to act in terms of acceptable ethical standards.	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 1.4	9 12.5	35 48.6	3 4.2	21 29.2	3 4.2
26. Clients understand the mission and standards of my field.	5 6.9	3 4.2	4 5.6	23 31.9	27 37.5	4 5.6	4 5.6	2 2.8
27. I feel that people need to clearly establish the relationship between my vocation and that of allied occupations.	0 0.0	2 2.8	5 6.9	16 22.2	37 51.4	3 4.2	6 8.3	3 4.2
28. I feel there is a need to create more intelligent and practically rewarding collaboration between my job areas and other similar areas.	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 4.2	10 13.9	35 48.6	10 13.9	11 15.3	3 4.2
29. I feel that there is a need to define the formal relationship between the practitioners in my field and consumers who use our services.	0 0.0	1 1.4	7 9.7	17 23.6	29 40.3	6 8.3	8 11.1	4 5.6
30. I feel that the relation of work of practitioners in my field to the users of our services should be made a subject of inservice or preservice education.	1 1.4	2 2.8	5 6.9	18 25.0	26 36.1	6 8.3	7 9.7	7 9.7

LOCUS OF CONTROL

The comparison of Locus of Control scores over the three time periods is reported in Table 14. The test is scored on the direction of externality. The higher the score, the more external the staff member. There are 40 items on the scale. There are no significant differences between the means of the staff at the three different testings.

TABLE 14

LOCUS OF CONTROL OF MAINE YOUTH CENTER STAFF

	Mean	SD	N
Winter 1980	8.69	5.47	(70)
Summer 1980	7.13	4.62	(53)
Spring 1981	8.39	4.26	(70)

APPENDIX A

Techniques of Reality Therapy That Have Worked Well Reported

Summer 1980 staff

Treating people as human beings

I feel that once they have lost points and have had to write a plan that's acceptable to us we have had better cooperation. With some it has taken quite awhile but eventually they have realized that to be here they have to be accepted.

Working nights the most valuable tehcnique for me is friendship.

Making friends, involvement, not giving up, not accepting excuses, following natural consequences.

Getting you to look at himself and face responsibility for his actions.

Accountability.

Making friends I think is the best one I have dealt with.

Isolation steps.

By letting youth realize he is a product of his own environment and he can be the only one to change.

Accept no excuse/make a commitment/never give up.

Making them responsible for their behavior.

Friendship/behaviorism/evaluating.

I have had some degree of success in making the students responsible for themselves.

Making friends with youth/getting them to look at their behavior/being persistent.

Involvement, value judgements (student; no excuse, no punishment, natural consequences, never give up)

Working with the present situation - forgetting what is past.

Stressing positive accomplishments and pointing out students' strengths and assets.

Involvement/stressing responsibility/looking at behaviors and corrective alternatives.

Being persistent/forcing youth to face up to what he's doing.

Keeping them working productively - it leads to good things.
Always reward good effort and work.
Speak the truth even when it hurts.

Getting youth to look at and evaluate their behavior/being persistent/getting youth to look at their values.

Counseling.

Following the rules that have been set up.

Although I am not dealing directly with the youth I use Reality Therapy both with my subordinates and at home and my wife and myself find it works very well.

Having youth stop and think of what they are doing.

No excuses/repetition.

All techniques.

Involvement is the key.

Not accepting excuses/plan formation when utilized/not punishing.

Little contact with clients but I am always friendly with them and view them as important young people.

The involvement phase works well-provides a good basis for working with kids.

They all work when properly applied. Some don't work as fast as others.

Making friends is easy for me as well as aiding the youth to look at his/her behavior and its cause and effect.

Generally by following the eight steps of Reality Therapy. It has helped me in all aspects of dealing with the clients.

Not giving up/friendship.

Plands and simple attainable and measurable allows counselor and client to be aware of where they are in treatment plans and goals.

Plans.

Stressing to the youth that he or she are directly responsible for their own decisions and actions and will have to pay the consequences.

Spring 1981

Maintenance: With the commitment in plan setting, because of the natural trend for youth to slip back and fourth for re: an no reasons other than them just being youth.

Making friends of clients.

Spring 1981 (Continued)

The chart and identifying needs have been useful in stimulating discussion in substance abuse as well as other areas.

Helping students to realize their own problems.

Friendliness, firmness, no excuses.

Involvement with the residents. Acceptance of no excuses.

Displacement of control back to the student in planning.

Isolation.

Making friends.
Having fun.
Getting a commitment on a number of occasions.
Verbal commitment.

Plans.

All of them.

1. Making students aware of their capabilities for change through recognition and praise.
2. Self esteem.
3. Commitment to improvement between staff and residents.

What are you doing?

Getting youth to look at their behavior.

Isolation plan writing.

Making friends, facilitating the occurence of natural consequences, and never giving up.

Getting youth to look at their behavior.
Getting youth to evaluate what they are doing.
Getting youth to set a plan to do better.
Being persistent.

Persistence in having student evaluate and look at their own behaviors.

Basically the whole concept, now having a base to work with.

No "techniques" but the good sense and human concerns of RT are very effective.

Make friends, change their behavior, get commitments, no excuses, being persistent.

Soring 1981 (Continued)

Using the steps of RT in an honest direct manner - involvement is the key.

Helping the resident to look at his/her values.

Involvement is the key to RT you must be involved to even get to step I.

All.

Dealing with positive behaviors - what you can do, not what you should stop doing.

1. shifting decision-making to the student
2. goals

Making friends with the residents. Get them to make a plan and sticking with it.

1. goals
2. plan writing
3. basic steps of reality therapy

My previous education in psychology has yielded an open mind to Reality Therapy and I feel I can remain objective under most given circumstances.

Developing success identity, addressing needs, addressing self development, selfworth.

Getting cooperation

Making friends

Making friends with the youth I work with.
Getting youth to look at their behavior.
Getting youth to evaluate what they are doing.
Not accepting their excuses.
Being persistent.

Talking things over with the one's I might be working with.

Addressing the problem.
Helping students look at their problem.
Finding a solution to the problem.

Making friends - not being punitive
Getting kids to make a value judgement on their behavior.

Talking to student and warning them about the steps.

Not accepting their excuses.
Being persistent.

Spring 1981 (Continued)

Establish priorities
Responsibility for actions
Establishing trust
Not talking down to young people
No favoritism
Keeping your word
Follwo-up

Making the student stop and evaluate their own behavior.

Writing plans.

Being persistent and not letting up.

Not accepting excuses.
Not interfering with reasonable consequences.

What are you doing.

Plans.

Using positive actions.

Asking what are you doing. Is it helping making out plans. Not accepting excuses.

Plans.

Follwoing the guidelines that have been set down.

Making friends (involvement)
looking at and evaluating behaviors

The plan to do better has produced no faults.

APPENDIX B

Techniques of Reality Therapy That Have Not Worked - Well or With Which Staff Have Had Problems

Summer 1980

I find it hard to keep going over plans students have to write. They find it hard to answer the questions and come up with what they are going to do to improve, and I find that I may as well write it out for them and I find that I can't always have time.

None, but time/vast amounts are necessary to maintain meaningful involvement.

Getting a commitment.

Getting them to make a solid commitment.

However, due to lack of continuous contact with the youth I feel I am unable to effect in change.

None, however plan writing is sometimes a problem.

Making plans.

Persistence tends to be interpreted as "on my case" so the persistence has to be modified to sporadic at best and spontaneous in most situations.

Plan writing remains the main weakness.

Plan writing/getting them to make commitment to change/getting youth to look at their values.

Making friends with youth.

There are times when it is best to put off "being persistent and bring up the problem later."

Having youth to write plans.

Getting commitment and specific plans have not met with the best success.

Plan writing after committing an infraction of the rules seems to be a farce. There is an evident lack of commitment by the student. The student sees this as a useless waste of time simply to gain program reentry.

Making plans and follow-up.

Getting commitments to change/getting youth to look at their values.

Have not been involved with student planning.

Students making written plans with meaning.

APPENDIX B
(Continued)

Summer 1980 (Continued)

Plan writing

The techniques that probably would not work for me are making a plan and a commitment. Working nights makes this difficult.

Planning and carrying out of plans when youth plan is conjunction with authority there is confusion over whose plan it really is and the worth of the plan is called into question.

Plan writing.

Plan making would not be the one that would work well because on nights, there would be no follow-up.

Everything seems to work well if the person in charge correctly uses R.T. The only minor problem has been a pressure from Control/ICU to accept plans and the fact that if the student is a borderline illiterate his plans without staff supervision are usually very shallow and onconsistent.

Spring 1981

Holding clients to their commitments.

The disciplinary steps and plan writing do not seem to have much of an impact to most residents.

I think sometimes kids are dealt with too lightly.

Plan writing, discipline steps.

Never growing up - sometimes hard to follow.

Not punishing, but no interfering with natural consequences.

Plan writing.

Working on plans (either daily plans or specific incidents) I find that I'm not terribly inventive, but I do stress success over small gains and I do try to reinforce daily plans even if the plan is repetitious.

None

None of them.

None.

Making friends with youth

APPENDIX B
(Continued)

Summer 1980 (Continued)

Getting clients to make self evaluations of their behavior, making and keeping commitments, and "owning their own behavior" i.e. accepting responsibility and not making excuses.

None, not working with greater number of students.

Very few opportunities in plan writing.

S.I.R. revised. Good approach and documentation. But if used well after the incident student still is removed to J.C.P.?

Getting students to write plans that they think instead of what they think we want to hear.

Currently I feel I have no weakends although overall improvement will continue to increase.

Plan writing, the kids will write anything to get what they think you want to hear.

All

Plan writing - students level of commitment is poor, most of the time.

Getting students to follow through on commitments.

Dealing with kids who screw up continuously, I lose my patience at times.

1. Plan writing - what to accept and what not to.

Making students realize that this whole encounter is really serious and must be dealt with with a degree of sincerity.

None

Plan writing

Getting youth to look at their behavior (honestly), and evaluate what they are doing.

None

None

Getting youth to set a plan to do better.
Getting them to make a commitment to change.
Not punishing, but not interfering with natural consequences.

None

APPENDIX B
(Continued)

Summer 1980 (Continued)

Getting a commitment and following through

Plan writing is hard for some to understand and to keep their commitment.

Getting youth to evaluate what they are doing.
Getting them to make a commitment to change.

Paper work - Plans - Time element getting residents put in ICW for continued negative behavior after plans - minor point loss, etc.

Following through on commitments. Students find it easy to come up with a commitment to change however, doing it is another thing. Staff persistence seldom helps.

Hold for courts.

Having a boy agree to make a plan to change and having him mean what he says are worlds apart - but it's a start. I have trouble dealing with their phoniness in dealing with their own problems where I know they are lying to themselves.

Time for training.

Plans

None

Students not following daily plans.

Commitments carried out.

I have a problem of understanding the program when someone is trying to ram it down your throat, so to speak. When there are duties to perform. To have the backing one needs and have communication.

Plans
Commitments

PT isn't its problem - it's the mechanics of its process that foul things up.

APPENDIX C

Ways Maine Youth Staff Have Made Use of Reality Therapy

Tracking - Counseling - Getting commitments.

Home, Family, People in General.

As set forth in MYC policy.

I have not given up.

In pointing out negative behavior.

Day-to-day contact with residents.

Changing behavior pattern.

I'm very firm in what I stress for accepted behavior but I feel that I try to incorporate fun with the kids while dealing with them. I'm not out to nail them over every little thing.

Plans, Consequences, Making friends.

Taking time for "small talk" with students - words of encouragement, their goals, smiles and an air of acceptance of them regardless of their status, etc.

1. In dealing with student's plans and commitments to change.
2. In evaluating student progress.

Too early to know

Getting youth to look at their behavior.
Being persistent.

Yes, in the moral interpretation of Biblical material.
In self evaluation of what degree am I what I expect of the student.

Plans, steps of isolation, daily goals, long-term goals. The ability to make an individual think what he is doing, why, etc.

a. with my own children
b. with subordinate employees

Individual counseling of students in classes.

Students are responsible for their behavior and set that across to them that they have to change.

Making friends with boys in cottage.

All aspects of treatment and in my own daily life.

Seldomly - dealing with residents in disciplinary situation.
Getting commitments from the person.

Assisting cottage life staff whenever a question arises pertaining to R.T.

Dealing with the four basic needs and the identity charts.

Plans and commitments to do better.

Personally, I work to achieve successful identity in a job where monetary reward is small, I seek improved status, gaining worth and recognition.

Shifting decision-making to the student.
Goals

Being positive and realistic in dealing with students.

It is a way of life in my classroom.

Daily contact.

In response to behavioral problems in ICU and in orientation of new admissions to ICU and infirmary.

In every way I think is right.

Handling discipline problems.

By trying to get involved with student by knowing his outside problems so you can try to help him more.

Not accepting their excuses.
Being persistent.

Turning negative thinking into positive.
Help to establish self respect.

Trying to teach them that they are responsible for their own behavior.

In the ways I deal with all people.

Getting youth to set a plan to do better.

Crisis situations
plans for leaves

1. the right steps.
2. reasoning with the students, making friends, getting youth to look and correct their behaviors, no excuses, being persistent.

By explaining to all youth's what is expected of them while being process and policy, of MYC.

Alderfer, C. P., Convergent and Discriminant Validation of Satisfaction and Desire Measures by Interviews and Questionnaires. Journal of Applied Psychology. 1967, 51, 509-520.

Cattell, R. B., and Eber, H. W. Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, Champaign, Ill.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1967.

Drummond, R. J. Reality Therapy Attitude Scale. Oroni, Me.: College of Education, 1980.

Drummond, R. J. Reality Therapy Activities Questionnaire, Orono, Me.: College of Education, 1980.

Drummond, R. J. Attitude Toward Professionalism Scale, Orono, Me.: College of Education, 1981.

Glasser, W. Reality Therapy. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Moos, R. H. Correctional Institutions Environment Scale. Palo Alto, Cal.: Consulting Psychological Press, 1974.

Nowicki, S., and Duke, M. P. A Locus of Control Scale for Adults: An Alternative to Rotter. Unpublished Paper, Emory University, 1972.

Nowicki, S., and Duke, M. P. A Locus of Control Scale for Children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 40, 148-151.

Super, D. Work Values Inventory, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1970.